DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 023 SP 022 955

AUTHOR Griffin, Gary A.
TITLE Expectations for Student Teaching: What Are They and Are They Realized?
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9034
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
AVAILABLE FROM Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; *Expectation; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

This paper, part of a larger study conducted by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin, presents findings regarding what expectations are brought to student teaching by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The expectations of 93 student teachers, 91 cooperating teachers, and 17 university supervisors are discussed in terms of themes, and the degree to which their expectations are perceived as being met is reported. Relation of expectations to other personal and professional characteristics of participants is discussed, and implications of the findings are suggested. Discrepancies between participants' views of student teaching's value as a component of teacher preparation programs and the study's conclusions on the same subject are detailed. It is noted that constructs measured by survey instruments included: empathy, locus of control, flexibility, education preference in terms of traditional to progressive, teacher concerns, self-esteem, conceptual level, cognitive style, the work of teaching, and vocabulary. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234023

SP

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHING: WHAT ARE THEY AND ARE THEY REALIZED?

Gary A. Griffin

Report No. 9034

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1983

SP022 955

EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHING:
WHAT ARE THEY AND ARE THEY REALIZED?

Introduction

There is ample testimony to the high value teachers place upon their student teaching experiences. This testimony ranges from the technical ("I didn't learn how to prepare reading seatwork until I had to do it in a real classroom") through the substantive ("Student teaching helped me to understand the need for a solid curriculum for even little kids") to the philosophical ("The experience illustrated how important it is to have a point of view about teaching and learning"). These hypothetical examples are only three from a host which could be cited. Certainly, the research and practice literature about teacher education provides evidence of the belief that student teaching is a powerful professional intervention.

A recent large-scale study of student teaching raises certain questions about this power (Griffin, et al., Note 1) but the questions emerge more as a consequence of the observations of practice from a research team outside the experience than from participants in the process. (The data from our study suggest, for example, that the student teaching experience as displayed in the study sites was in some conceptual disarray, suffered from an inadequate knowledge base, and tended to be rooted in beliefs about positive interpersonal relationships at the expense of disciplined and systematic demonstration and refinement of teaching knowledge and skill [Edwards, Note 2]).

Despite the possibility that our questions regarding the power of student teaching to promote certain teaching knowledge and skill are valid across more settings than the ones we studied, there is little question that student teaching will continue to be the capstone of professional preparation for teachers and recalled by participants as a singularly important event in their

preservice programs. Given the observed persistence of positive ex post facto values regarding student teaching combined with a set of research-derived conclusions that raise questions about that value, it is intriguing to speculate regarding whether or not the expectations brought to the experience can suggest common themes which could partially explain what seems to be a dichotomous situation.

This paper presents findings regarding what expectations are brought to student teaching by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The larger study from which the material in this paper was drawn is described briefly. The expectations are discussed in terms of themes and the degree to which the expectations are perceived as being met is reported. The relation of expectations to other personal and professional characteristics of participants is discussed and implications of the findings are suggested.

The RITE Study of Student Teaching

This paper draws upon data collected by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Data were drawn from two higher education sites, one a large public university whose student teachers were assigned to schools in a mid-sized urban school district. In this school district, participants included 44 student teachers, 43 cooperating teachers, and 13 university supervisors. The second site was a large, private university located in a large urban center. Here, data were collected on 49 student teachers, 48 cooperating teachers, and 4 university supervisors. The sample was composed of a general and an intensive group of participants. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 effective cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers, 20 in all, and

the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed the intensive sample. The remainder of the participants were assigned membership to what was called the general sample. The intensive sample participants provided the research team with copies of personal journals, audiotapes of their supervision conferences, interviews on three occasions, and observations in their classrooms. Both samples, general and intensive, responded to questionnaires and a variety of instruments that measured constructs deemed to be potentially influential upon student teaching and on the participants in the process. The constructs measured by these instruments included empathy, locus of control, flexibility, educational preference in terms of traditional to progressive, teacher concerns, self-esteem, conceptual level, cognitive style, the work of teaching, and vocabulary. In addition, RITE staff designed three outcome measures to determine satisfaction of participants, performance ratings of self and others, and the degree to which expectations were met by the student teaching experience. Data were collected over an eighteen-week academic semester.

The findings from the larger descriptive study include attention to the relationships between personal and professional characteristics, changes in participants over time, the nature of the context influences upon the process, the supervision and evaluation procedures, teaching, and the relation of these phenomena to outcomes (Griffin, et al., Note 3). This paper gives particular attention to the issue of expectations for student teaching.

Expectations for Student Teaching

In that the RITE study of student teaching planned to measure the degree to which expectations were met, initial interviews and questionnaires administered prior to the start of student teaching included a section on what student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors expected of

the experience. The responses to this section of the interview were subjected to content analysis and the results of the content analyses were then transformed into questionnaire items.

Student Teachers

The content analysis of interview and questionnaire responses from student teachers revealed three overarching themes that were subsequently incorporated into an expectations questionnaire. These themes can be characterized as (1) what the student teacher expected to like about student teaching, (2) what the student teacher expected to be asked to do during student teaching, and (3) and how the student teacher expected to spend his or her time as a student teacher. Within these themes a range of objects of attention were found. In terms of what was expected to be liked, the objects included students' academic and social progress, interacting with students, management of behavior problems, grading, and planning lessons. Within the theme of what was expected to be done were included presentation of subject matter, relating personally to students, meeting students' individual needs, handling behavior problems, and establishing one's self as a teacher. The theme of time use included as objects working at home, preparing lesson plans, classroom teaching, grading, performing routine administrative tasks, meeting with the cooperating teacher, and others. In addition, a set of questions regarding the student teachers' perceptions of their preparatory academic work at the university was included.

Cooperating Teachers

Initial interview and questionnaire data from cooperating teachers regarding expectations for student teaching revealed two overarching themes, time use and student teacher behavior. In terms of time, the objects of attention for cooperating teachers were time spent planning with student

teachers, observing student teachers, providing feedback, conferencing, and contacts with university supervisors. Regarding expectations for student teacher behavior, objects of attention included preparation, acquiring a sense of classroom routines, assuming responsibility for instruction, classroom management, grading and evaluating pupils' class work, planning, and others. In addition to these two themes, two other issues stood out as prominent expectations but did not lend themselves to categorization. These were expectations related to "liking" the student teacher and the provision of competent supervision by the university supervisor.

University Supervisors

The questionnaire and interview responses from university supervisors revealed, as was the case for student and cooperating teachers, a preoccupation with time. In addition to this theme, university supervisors had expectations regarding interactions with other members of the student teaching triad and generalized student and cooperating teacher skills. The objects of attention regarding time use included observation, providing feedback, leading seminars, meeting with other members of the triad, and routine matters. The content of the interactions theme was generalized (e.g., "I expect to have positive interactions") rather than specific to task or knowledge. The issue of skill had to do with cooperating teacher supervision and student teacher demonstration of teaching. In addition, a question was inserted by RITE staff asking for an overall response to the semester's supervising experience.

Data Collection and Analysis

As noted above, the expectations held for student teaching were collected from the entire sample of the RITE study. Subsequent to the determination of the themes which dominated the expectations and the components of the themes

as reported by respondents, the themes and their components were transformed into questionnaire items. Items were placed in a 5-point Likert-response format indicating the degree to which the expectations were met, from "Less than I expected" to "More than I expected" with some items and "Better than I expected" to "Not as well as I expected" in others. One scale was developed for members of each role group; student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors (the scales are appended to this paper). Because of this, the measures are not comparable across roles.

The questionnaires were administered to the entire sample of the RITE study of student teaching during the last week of the academic semester. Because of some missing data and incomplete or otherwise unusable questionnaires, the number of questionnaires used for this paper came to 84 for student teachers, 85 cor cooperating teachers, and 17 for university supervisors.

Means, standard deviations, and mid-points were determined for each set of responses by role group. Also, correlations between the scale scores, again by role group, and other construct measures used in the larger study were computed. The analyses allowed the research team to draw conclusions regarding the degree to which expectations were met and the relationships that expectations scores had to other constructs as well as to speculate on the relation between expectations findings and other conclusions drawn from the larger study.

Findings

Findings regarding the degree to which participants in student teaching perceived the experience as meeting their expectations will be discussed first. Then the correlations between these findings and other constructs will be presented.

Student Teacher Expectations

For purposes of analysis and presentation, the items were grouped according to three subscales: Orientation to Teaching (discussed above as what the student teachers expected to like about student teaching), Teaching Competence (discussed above as what the student expected to do in student teaching), and Time. The mean scores on each of these subscales are well below the midpoint, indicating that the student teachers' expectations in each of these areas were exceeded (Table 1). They found the experience more to their liking and found themselves better prepared than they expected (Orientation). They reported that they were more competent than expected (Competence). Finally, they reported that they spent more time in teacher-related activities than expected. As can be seen from Table 2, there were not substantial differences due to site (State/Lakeview vs. Metropolitan/Urban). However, with regard to sample differences, intensive sample student teachers reported that their expectations regarding orientation and competence were met rather than exceeded. These observations were confirmed by analysis of variance.

Cooperating Teacher Expectations

The cooperating teacher expectations questionnaire consisted of 17 items which were eventually scored as a single scale, collapsing the themes of time and student teacher behavior. The mean score falls close to the midpoint, indicating that the cooperating teachers' initial expectations were met, though not exceeded. Due to their more extensive classroom experience, it may be that their expectations would be more congruent with their experience than those of the student teachers with theirs. There were not substantial

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Expectation Scales for Student Teachers, Cooperating Teachers, and University Supervisors

Instruments	Scale Characteristics				
	Means	Standard Deviation	Possible Range of Scores	Mid Point	N
Expectations					
Student Teacher					
Orientation	15.45	3.84	6-30	18	84
Competence	10.43	3.72	5-25	15	84
Time	31.87	6.42	12-60	36	84
Cooperating Teacher	50.89	11.61	17-85	51	85
University Supervisor	3.15	.78	1-5	3	17

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor Expectation Scales, and Student Teacher Satisfaction Scale by Site and Sample

	Possible Range	SU** $\bar{X}$	SU s.d.	MU*** $\bar{X}$	MU s.d.	Intensive Sample $\bar{X}$	Intensive Sample s.d.	General Sample $\bar{X}$	General Sample s.d.
Student Teacher Expectations									
Orientation*	6-30	15.40	3.92	15.51	3.79	17.11	2.97	15.00	3.94
Competence*	5-25	10.05	3.59	10.83	3.85	12.06	3.12	9.99	3.77
Time*	12-60	31.07	4.71	32.71	2.80	32.33	4.69	31.74	6.84
Cooperating Teacher Expectations	17-85	52.15	12.12	49.73	11.14	51.15	12.01	50.82	11.58
University Supervisor Expectations	11-55	30.54	5.81	25.50	5.32	28.33	5.68	30.50	6.44

*Items scored in reverse.

**State University (pseudonym)

***Metropolitan University (pseudonym)

differences in cooperating teachers' expectations due to site or sample effects. This observation was confirmed by analysis of variance.

University Supervisor Expectations

The university supervisor expectations questionnaire consisted of eleven items which were scored as a single scale, collapsing the themes noted above (See Table 1). As with cooperating teachers, the mean score falls close to the midpoint of the scale, indicating congruence between their initial expectations and their subsequent experience. Because most of the supervisors had had previous classroom experience as well as supervisory experience, it again may be that there should be more congruence between their expectations and experience than between those of the student teachers and their experiences. As with the cooperating teachers, there were no substantial differences between the university supervisors' expectations scores due to site or sample effects. This observation was also confirmed by analysis of variance.

Correlations of Expectations Scores with Other Constructs

As noted above, the RITE study included instruments measuring a variety of constructs considered potentially influential upon student teaching. In addition to these constructs, the formal evaluations of the two university programs of teacher education were included as outcome measures. (Other outcomes measures were satisfaction and performance ratings of each member of a student teaching triad by other members [Hughes & Hukill, Note 4]).

Correlations between expectations and formal evaluations.. Significant correlations were obtained between the Student Teaching Expectations subscales and the final formal institutional evaluations. The Expectations subscales consisted of a series of Likert-type self-report items, upon which student teachers rated the degree of match between their prior expectations and their

perceptions of the actual experience. Thus, the negative correlations displayed in Table 3 reflect an association between high evaluation ratings and student teachers' beliefs that their expectations were met or surpassed. The correlations for the Time subscale were not statistically significant.

Expectations regarding time appear unrelated to the final evaluation ratings. Raw amounts of time spent in preparation or planning for any task may not be related to the successful completion of the task; one must consider other factors such as how efficiently or effectively that time was used.

The remaining significant expectations subscale correlations with final evaluation ratings supplement the picture of evaluative consistency. The Orientation subscale scores showed a strong positive correlation with the formal institutional evaluations. Competence subscale scores correlated highly with student teachers' final evaluations.

The final Expectations subscale, inserted by the research team and not drawn from expectations interviews, examined the degree to which student teachers found their previous coursework to be helpful during the clinical experience. This subscale was inconsistent in its relationships with formal evaluations. The correlations with supervisors' ratings were significant but not the correlation with the Professional Competency subscale ratings given by cooperating teachers.

Expectations and personal and professional constructs. Relationships between personality, attitude, and cognitive measures were examined in relation to expectations. These relationships were examined in two ways. First, correlations were computed between the entry characteristics of the individuals and the outcomes (i.e., satisfaction, institutional evaluations, and performance ratings). Second, residual gain scores were computed to assess the degree of change that occurred during the semester, and these gain

Table 3

Correlations between Student Teaching Expectations Subscale Scores and Supervisor or Cooperating Teacher Mean Final Evaluation Ratings of Student Teachers[1]

	University Supervisors		Cooperating Teachers	
	Teaching Competency Subscale	Professional Competency Subscale	Teaching Competency Subscale	Professional Competency Subscale
Orientation to the Professional	-.2460** (N = 81)	-.2207* (N = 81)	-.2687** (N = 80)	-.1909* (N = 80)
Competence	-.2982** (N = 81)	-.3050** (N = 81)	-.3450** (N = 80)	-.3149** (N = 80)
Time	-.1643 (N = 81)	-.1011 (N = 81)	-.1400 (N = 80)	-.1646 (N = 80)
Value of Prior Courses	-.2643** (N = 81)	-.2569** (N = 81)	-.1871** (N = 80)	-.1304 (N = 80)

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

[1]Note that the Expectations Subscales were scored in a reverse manner.

scores were correlated with the outcomes. (A detailed discussion of the relationships among the entire set of constructs included in the study can be found in Hughes & Hukill, Note 4.)

As one examines the pattern of correlations (Table 4), empathy emerges as a predictor of met expectations for student teachers. Self-esteem was also related to spending more time than expected and feeling more confident than expected. Student teacher concerns also appear to show consistent patterns in relation to expectations. High entry-level self and impact concerns seem to be associated with exceeded expectations. These findings suggest that few of the student teachers' entry characteristics as measured in this study were strongly related to whether their expectations were met. (Note that Table 4 includes only those characteristics for which significant correlations were found and does not include all of the characteristics measured.)

Considering the relationships of residual scores to outcomes (Table 4), changes in self-esteem, conceptual level, self and impact concerns, and locus of control are related to expectations, especially to whether or not the students' expectations regarding what they liked (orientation) about student teaching.

Among cooperating teachers, there were no significant correlations between any of the entry variables or residual gain scores and expectations.

For university supervisors there were two significant correlations between expectations and both locus of control and educational preference (Table 4). Those supervisors with more internal control and progressive educational philosophies were more likely to indicate that they had spent more time than they expected.

Table 4. Correlations of Entry Scores and Residual Gains on Selected Characteristics with Expectation Scales

Instrument		Expectations				
		CT	ST			US
			Orientation	Competence	Time	
Vocabulary						
Empathy	Entry Score			-.26**	-.28**	
	Residual Gain					
Locus of Control	Entry Score					-.40*
	Residual Gain		-.24**			.48*
Flexibility	Entry Score				-.26**	
	Residual Gain					
Educational Philosophy	Entry Score					-.47*
	Residual Gain					
Self Concerns	Entry Score		-.36**	-.21*		
	Residual Gain		-.17*			-.74**
Task Concerns	Entry Score		-.24**			
	Residual Gain					
Impact Concerns	Entry Score		-.38**	-.26**		
	Residual Gain		-.20*			
Self-Esteem	Entry Score		-.24**	-.26**		
	Residual Gain		-.23*			
Conceptual Level	Entry Score		.20*			
	Residual Gain		-.26**	-.25**		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

The correlations of the gain scores and expectations of university supervisors also appear in Table 4. An increase in university supervisors' self concerns is related to indications that he/she spent more time than expected and that the experience went less well than expected. Alternately, the finding that those supervisors whose locus of control scores increased indicated that they spent less time with their supervisory responsibilities and perceived the experience more positively than expected. (The Time items are reversed for this measure.)

Discussion

This paper began with an informal hypothesis that understanding the expectations that are brought to teaching might help to clarify the contradiction that emerges between participants' perceptions of student teaching and a research team's observations and conclusions regarding that experience. Restated, participants generally agree that student teaching is a powerful and valuable component of teacher preparation programs. The RITE study of student teaching, a comprehensive examination of people, process, and contexts, concluded that student teaching in the sites studied was problemmatic on several grounds.

Although this paper has not presented data to support the RITE claims regarding the problematic nature of student teaching, other reports provide the necessary research bases for them (Edwards, Note 2; Griffin, et al., Note 3; Hughes & Hukill, Note 4; O'Neal, Note 5). These claims include the following.

First, the disciplined inquiry into schooling in general and teaching in particular which has characterized the past several decades has apparently made little impact upon the policies and practices of student teaching. Second, participants in the student teaching experience as observed in this

study can be characterized as dedicated, well-meaning, and caring individuals who base their actions in a service orientation. That is, the cooperating teachers operate out of a perspective which promotes the well-being and comfort of the self rather than one which acts upon a set of carefully articulated performance standards for professional practice. Third, awareness of policies, expectations, purposes, and desirable practices from an institutional point of view is not widespread across participants in the student teaching experience. Fourth, there was only minimal evidence that the student teaching programs studied were integrated substantively or ideologically into the university preservice programs of instruction. There appeared to be no carefully conceptualized "point of view" driving the experience. Fifth, there were few instances of demonstrated policy, practice, or personal linkages between the university and the public school settings. Sixth, the student teaching experience can be characterized somewhat as the teaching profession has been -- as a "lonely" profession. In the same way that practicing teachers tend to be isolated from their colleagues by the nature of the school organization and by the ways in which schools have been designed, the student teacher-cooperating teacher dyad appears to be isolated from other dyads and, indeed, from other cooperating teachers and student teachers.

These global and bold statements are supported by both quantitative and qualitative data and appropriate analyses and syntheses.

Returning to the issue of expectations, I will focus more upon the expectations themselves than upon the relationship of expectations to other personal and professional constructs and outcomes of student teaching. These relationships will be referred to when appropriate.

Generally, it can be concluded that the expectations elicited from the RITE sample are global and general. Although the issue of time might be considered to infer specificity, the issues upon which time was expected to be spent was again general. The student teachers expected to like "seeing students make academic and social progress," for instance. They did not note what particular kinds of progress would be desirable or what rates of progress would meet their expectations. The cooperating teachers' expectations for student teachers had to do with such issues as "assuming responsibility for instruction" without indicating <u>how</u> that assumption of responsibility would meet their expectations. The cooperating teachers also expected student teachers to be "prepared for student teaching." Does this mean prepared to adopt the ongoing norms of the classroom? To be knowledgeable about subject matter? To have a repertoire of pedagogical skills? To have an understanding of the growth and development patterns of particular groups of classroom students? The university supervisors' expectations were also global and general. They expected positive interactions with student teachers and competent supervision by cooperating teachers, for example. Were the interactions to be professionally collegial? Socially collegial? Focused on the tasks associated with teaching? Systematically formulated, monitored, and evaluated? Problem-oriented? Was the "competent supervision" to be rooted in an understanding of adult development? Based upon an extant model? A vehicle for solution of problems?

Naturally, these rhetorical questions cannot be answered, given the level of specificity demonstrated by the RITE sample members. They arise, however, exactly <u>because</u> of this lack of specificity in participants' responses to the interview questions. Because the RITE study was a descriptive one and careful attention was paid to being as minimally intrusive as possible, we did not

attempt to move the subjects toward this specificity. What was startling was that this relatively global and, I would argue, not particularly useful set of expectation statements was maintained across the sample. Attention to the particulars of either research-derived or craft knowledge was conspicuous by its absence.

Returning to the set of conclusions already noted, it becomes less of a surprise that they can be supported from our data if one hunches that expectations do, in fact, influence behavior. That is, if the expectations for an experience are lacking in clarity and precision, it is possible that the experience itself will be lacking in clarity and precision. If expectations are rooted in conceptions of practice that are neither operational nor observable with complementary criteria for determination of degree of presence, it is possible that "something else" will fill the vacuum. In the case of the RITE study, that observed, if not internally perceived, void appeared to be filled by the presence of frequent and intense demonstrations of personal regard. As the correlations with outcome measures showed, empathy was the single most powerful predictor of outcomes. High empathy was associated with met expectations, high levels of satisfaction, and institutional evaluations. These relationships have a logical "feel" to them. What was somewhat surprising was the continuing predictive ability of empathy in terms of performance ratings by members of the student teaching triads. It is this last outcome measure that asked for judgments about the acts of teaching, supervising, and interacting professionally. There is the strong possibility in our data that the participants in the study were, in effect and probably not with conscious intentions, substituting professional knowledge and skill with positive interpersonal interactions. This is strongly

supported by other interview data and by analysis of supervision conferences between student and cooperating teachers.

My concern is rooted in a fundamental belief that even in the so-called "helping professions" it is necessary to operate from codified knowledge and skill bases, whether they be derived from research or craft. Although there may have been a time when it was not possible to tap into these bodies of knowledge and skill, I do not believe that such is reasonable in these times. We have several decades of research findings which, variously, provide direction for thinking about and doing teaching. We have much clearer understandings about the nature of schools as workplaces. Certainly, we are preoccupied with the relation of school to the larger society. There are points of view about teaching and learning which are widely discussed. There is a technology of student evaluation. Our practices can be informed by the results of disciplined inquiry into the nature of childhood and the ways in which young people grow and develop.

Where are these considerations in the expectations of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors as they enter what is believed to be the most important component of teacher preparation? In our sample we did not find them in any measurable number, explicitly or implicitly. Has the continued divorce of theory and practice persisted to the degree that even such etched-in-stone propositions as those often found in child psychology texts are not considered appropriate topics for consideration by teaching novices and teaching experts? Has the rejection of research as an esoteric, impractical, and ivory tower activity exerted such an influence that <u>all</u> research findings are left outside the schoolhouse door? And, importantly, have these and related possibilities influenced not just the public elementary and secondary schools but also the colleges of education?

Naturally, these closing speculations and the findings from which they emerge are subject to a variety of limitations. The research methodology may have been inadequate to the task. This basically secondary analysis of data may have asked too much of the original information. My own points of view certainly may have created too narrow a field of vision to have captured information which would counter the positions expressed here. These and other possibilities are acknowledged.

These concerns and considerations, however, would not have emerged without a systematic and broadly conceived examination of student teaching as an educative opportunity. The immersion in the experience and the subsequent activities related to understanding that experience gave rise to many questions which were not part of the original research design. This, in my view, is a significant and positive outcome of going about the tasks of systematic inquiry.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G.A., Hughes, R., Jr., Barnes, S.G., Carter, H., Defino, M.E., & Edwards, S. The student teaching experience (Research Proposal submitted to National Institute of Education). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, June 1981.
2. Edwards, S. Clinical preservice activities: Education, development, training--three case studies. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982.
3. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., Jr., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
4. Hughes, R., Jr., & Hukill, H. Participant characteristics, change, and outcomes in preservice clinical teacher education. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982.
5. O'Neal, S. Supervision of student teachers: Feedback and evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.

STUDENT TEACHING EXPECTATION SCALE

Directions: For the following aspects of your student teaching experience, please indicate the relationship between what you expected and what actually occurred during student teaching. Circle the appropriate response.

	More than I expected		The same as I expected		Less than I expected
I liked seeing my students make academic progress.	1	2	3	4	5
I liked seeing my students make social progress.	1	2	3	4	5
I liked interacting with my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I liked managing behavior problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I liked grading.	1	2	3	4	5
I liked the time spent on planning lessons.	1	2	3	4	5

	Better than I expected		As well as I expected		Not as well as I expected
I was able to present the subject matter so that the students understood.	1	2	3	4	5
I related personally to the students.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to meet individual students' needs.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to handle behavior problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I established myself as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

For the following items indicate whether the TIME you spent was more than you expected, the same as you expected or less than you expected.

	More than I expected		The same as I expected		Less than I expected
Time spent at the school (not the university).	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent at home working on student teaching matters.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent preparing lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent in classroom teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent grading students' work.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent in routine paper work.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent conferring with individual students.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent in extracurricular activities with your students.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent in contact with parents.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent with your cooperating/ master teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent with your university supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
Time spent with other student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5

How valuable to your student teaching were the following preparatory experiences:

	Very Valuable		Somewhat Valuable		Not at all Valuable
Observations in classrooms prior to student teaching	1	2	3	4	5
Reading Methods Course	1	2	3	4	5
Math Methods Course	1	2	3	4	5
Other Methods Course (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5
Educational Psychology Course	1	2	3	4	5

I plan to teach after my certification YES NO

SUPERVISING/MASTER TEACHER EXPECTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: For the following aspects of your supervising/master teaching experiences, please indicate the relationship between your expectations and the actual experience. Circle the appropriate response.

	More than I expected		The same as I expected		Less than I expected
I liked working with my student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
The time I spent planning lessons with my student teacher was	1	2	3	4	5
The time I spent observing my student teacher was	1	2	3	4	5
The time I spent giving feedback to my student teacher was	1	2	3	4	5
The time I spent in conference with my student teacher was	1	2	3	4	5
The time I spent in contact with the university supervisor/coordinator was	1	2	3	4	5

	Better than I expected		As well as I expected		Not as well as I expected
The student teacher was prepared for student teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher acquired a sense of the classroom routines.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher assumed responsibility for instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher assumed responsibility for classroom management.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher got to know the pupils.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher assumed responsibility for grading/evaluating pupils' class work.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher assumed responsibility for planning.	1	2	3	4	5

	Better than I expected		As well as I expected		Not as well as I expected
The student teacher was able to handle behavior problems.	1	2	3	4	5
The student teacher was able to individualize instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to work as a colleague with the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
The university supervisor/coordinator provided competent supervision for the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR EXPECTATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

For the following aspects of your supervising experiences, please indicate the relationship between your expectations and the actual experience. Circle the appropriate response.

	Better than I expected		The same as I expected		Not as well as I expected	Not Applic.
In general last semester's supervising experience was	1	2	3	4	5	6
My interactions with my student teachers were	1	2	3	4	5	6
My interactions with the master/ supervising teachers were	1	2	3	4	5	6
The supervising/master teacher provided competent supervision for the student teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The student teacher acquired the skills of teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6

	More than I expected		The same as I expected		Less than I expected	Not Applic.
The time I spent observing was	1	2	3	4	5	6
The time I spent in providing feedback was	1	2	3	4	5	6
The time required by my seminars was	1	2	3	4	5	6
The time I spent in grading seminar students' work was	1	2	3	4	5	6
The time I spent with the super-vising/master teacher was	1	2	3	4	5	6
The time I spent handling routine matters for the university or the schools was	1	2	3	4	5	6

Do you have any other comments about your expectations vis a vis your experience this semester?